arXiv:1210.5526v1 [math.AP] 19 Oct 2012

THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR A COMPLEX MONGE-AMPÈRE TYPE EQUATION ON HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

BO GUAN AND QUN LI

Abstract. We are concerned with fully nonlinear elliptic equations on complex manifolds and search for technical tools to overcome difficulties in deriving *a priori* estimates which arise due to the nontrivial torsion and curvature, as well as the general (non-pseudoconvex) shape of the boundary. We present our methods, which work for more general equations, by considering a specific equation which resembles the complex Monge-Ampère equation in many ways but with crucial differences. Our work is motivated by recent increasing interests in fully nonlinear equations on complex manifolds from geometric problems.

Mathematical Subject Classification (2010): 58J05, 58J32, 32W20, 35J25, 53C55.

Keywords: Fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Kähler manifolds; *a priori* estimates; strict concavity property; Donaldson conjecture; Dirichlet problem.

1. Introduction

In this paper we continue our study in [18, 19] on fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampère type on complex manifolds. Let (M^n,ω) be a compact Hermitian manifold of dimension $n\geq 2$ with smooth boundary ∂M and $\bar M = M\cup\partial M$. Let χ be a smooth real $(1,1)$ form on $\bar M$. Define for a function $u\in C^2(M)$

$$\chi_u = \chi + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}\partial\bar\partial u.$$

We consider the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases} \chi_u^n = \psi\chi_u\wedge\omega^{n-1} \ \text{ in } \bar M,\\ u=\varphi \ \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

This is a fully nonlinear equation of Monge-Ampère type. Given $\psi\in C^\infty(\bar M)$ and $\varphi\in C^\infty(\partial M)$ we seek solutions $u\in C^\infty(\bar M)$ with $\chi_u>0$ so that equation (1.1) is elliptic; we shall call such functions in $C^2(\bar M)$ *admissible* or *strictly* χ*-plurisubharmoinc*. So we require $\psi>0$; when $\psi\geq 0$ equation (1.1) becomes degenerate.

Research of the second author was supported in part by an NSF grant.

Fully nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations have close and natural connections with problems in complex geometry and analysis. In Kähler geometry, the classical Calabi conjectures [5], [44], the Kähler-Ricci flow and solitons, and Donaldson's conjectures [11] concerning geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics, among others, all reduce to the existence, regularity and other questions about complex Monge-Ampère equations on Kähler manifolds. There has also been increasing interest in fully nonlinear equations other than the complex Monge-Ampère equation on complex or symplectic manifolds from geometric problems. In [12] Donaldson proposed the following equation

$$\chi_u^n = c\chi_u^{n-1} \wedge \omega \tag{1.2}$$

on closed Kähler manifolds in connection with moment maps. The equation was studied by Chen [7], Weinkove and Song [41], [42], [29] using parabolic methods. More recently Fang, Lai and Ma [14] extended the results of [29] to a class of fully nonlinear equations that cover both (1.1) (where ψ is constant) and (1.2). Another example which was important in leading us to (1.1) is the *V-soliton equation* introduced by La Nave and Tian [26] in their work on Kähler-Ricci flow on symplectic quotients.

It is well known that a key step in solving fully nonlinear elliptic equations is to derive *a priori* estimates up to second order derivatives. For the Dirichlet problems in Kähler or Hermitian manifolds there arise new substantial technical difficulties in deriving these estimates. Our main interest in this paper is to search for general techniques to overcome these difficulties. The methods presented in this paper work for more general equations and produce new results even for fully nonlinear equations in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and their real counterpart in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We shall focus on the Dirichlet problem (1.1) here; other equations will be treated in forthcoming papers.

We first state our result on the global estimates.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u \in C^4(M) \cap C^2(\bar{M})$ be an admissible solution of equation* (1.1) *where $\psi \in C^2(\bar{M})$, $\psi > 0$. Suppose there exists an admissible subsolution $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{M})$ satisfying*

$$\chi_{\underline{u}}^n \geq \psi \chi_{\underline{u}} \wedge \omega^{n-1} \quad \text{on } \bar{M}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then there exist C_1, C_2 depending on $|u|_{C^0(\bar{M})}$, $|\underline{u}|_{C^2(M)}$, the positive lower bound of $\chi_{\underline{u}}$ such that

$$\max_M |\nabla u| \leq C_1\big(1 + \max_{\partial M} |\nabla u|\big), \tag{1.4}$$

$$\Delta u \leq C_2\big(1 + \max_{\partial M} \Delta u\big). \tag{1.5}$$

The constant C_1 *depends in addition on* $\inf_M \psi > 0$ *but* C_2 *only on* $|\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{M})}$.

Suppose in addition that $\varphi \in C^4(\partial M)$ *and* $\underline{u} = u = \varphi$ *on* ∂M. *Then*

$$\max_{\partial M} \Delta u \leq C_3. \tag{1.6}$$

For closed manifolds we have the following results.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* (M, ω) *be a closed Hermitian manifold and* $u \in C^4(M)$ *be an admissible solution of equation* (1.1), *where* $\psi \in C^2(M)$, $\psi > 0$. *Suppose that there exists a function* $\underline{u} \in C^2(M)$ *satisfying*

$$n\chi_{\underline{u}}^{n-1} > (n-1)\psi\chi_{\underline{u}} \wedge \omega^{n-2} \;\text{ on } M. \tag{1.7}$$

Then

$$|\nabla u| \leq C_1, \;\; |\Delta u| \leq C_2 \;\text{ on } M. \tag{1.8}$$

The constant C_1 *depends in addition on* $\inf_M \psi > 0$ *but* C_2 *only on* $|\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}|_{C^{1,1}(M)}$.

The estimate for Δu in (1.8) is due to Fang, Lai and Ma [14] when both ω and χ are Kähler and ψ is a positive constant invariant. In our case the main issue is to control some extra third derivative terms which occur due to the nontrivial torsion of (M, ω) when it is only assumed to be Hermitian. The estimate also holds in the degenerate case ($\psi \geq 0$) since it does not require ψ to have a positive lower bound, and is independent of the gradient bound, i.e. C_2 is independent of C_1 in (1.4). The gradient estimate in (1.4) which is indispensable to solve the Dirichlet problem (1.1), is new even when (M, ω) is Kähler and $\chi = \omega$.

Using Theorem 1.1 we can prove the following existence result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* (M^n, ω) *be a compact Hermitian manifold with smooth boundary* ∂M, $\varphi \in C^\infty(\partial M)$, $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$ *and* $\psi > 0$. *Suppose there exists an admissible subsolution* $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{M})$ *satisfying* (1.3) *in* $\bar{M}$ *and* $\underline{u} = \varphi$ *on* ∂M. *Then the Dirichlet problem* (1.1) *admits a unique admissible solution* $u \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$.

Theorem 1.3 was proved for the complex Monge-Ampère equation by the authors in [18]. While equation (1.1) resembles the complex Monge-Ampère equation in many ways, there are some crucial differences and one needs substantially new techniques to derive the desired estimates. Especially, Theorem 1.3 is a new result even when M is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $\chi = 0$. In [27] Li considered the Dirichlet problems for complex Hessian equations in $\mathbb{C}^n$ assuming the existence of a *strict* subsolution. Equation (1.1), however, fails to satisfy some of the key structure conditions in [27].

Fundamental existence theorems were established by Yau [44] for the complex Monge-Ampère equation on closed Kähler manifolds (see also [1]), and by Caffarelli, Kohn, Nirenberg and Spruck [4] for the Dirichlet problem on strongly pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Cherrier and Hanani [8], [9], [25] made the first effort to extend these results to Hermitian manifolds, followed by [18], [34], [35], [45] etc. In [35] Tosatti and Weinkove were able to extend Yau's C^0 estimate completely to closed Hermitian manifolds and therefore established Calabi-Yau theorem for the Bott-Chern cohomology class. It would be desirable to derive C^0 estimate for equation (1.1) on closed Hermitian manifolds. In a different direction, the main result of [4] was extended by the first author [17] to general domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ under the assumption of existence of a subsolution, which found useful applications in some important work; see e.g. [21], [22], [6], [3] and [28]. This is part of the motivation for us not to impose any further assumption on the boundary beyond smoothness in Theorem 1.3, so that it would be more convenient to use in applications.

The parabolic Monge-Ampère equation on closed Hermitian manifolds was studied by Gill [15], Tosatti and Weinkove [38]. In a series of papers [30], [31], [32], [33] Streets and Tian investigated general curvature flows of Hermitian metrics. Generalizations of Yau's theorems to symplectic four-manifolds with compatible almost complex structures were proposed by Donaldson [13], and studied by Weinkove [43], Tosatti, Weinkove and Yau [39], [36], [37].

Deriving gradient estimates for fully nonlinear equations on complex manifolds turns out a rather surprisingly difficult task. For the Monge-Ampère equation it was carried out by Cherrier [8] and later rediscovered by P.-F. Guan [23] and Blocki [2]. It was, however, only very recently that Dinew and Kolodziej [10] were able to prove the gradient estimate for complex Hessian equations on Kähler manifolds using scaling techniques and Liouville type theorems. It would be interesting to extend our proof of the gradient estimate to more general equations, at least for χ-plurisubharmoinc solutions.

Remark 1.4. Theorem 1.3 was proved in [18] for the complex Monge-Ampère equation under the stronger assumption $\underline{u} \in C^4(\bar{M})$; see Theorem 1.1 of [18]. Using the methods of this paper it can be weakened to $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar{M})$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some basic formulas on Hermitian manifolds and present a crucial lemma on which our estimates in the subsequent sections will heavily depend. Section 3 and Section 4 are devoted to the proof of the maximum principles for $|\nabla u|$ and Δu, the gradient and Laplacian of u, respectively. In Section 5 we derive the boundary estimates for second derivatives, completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. Once these estimates are established, equation (1.1) becomes uniformly elliptic. We can therefore come back to derive global estimates for all (real) second derivatives as in Section 5 in [18] and apply the Evans-Krylov theorem for higher derivative estimates; Theorem 1.3 then may be proved by the continuity method. We shall omit these standard steps.

We wish to thank Wei Sun for carefully reading the manuscript and pointing out various errors in the previous versions.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we briefly recall some basic formulas to be used in the subsequent sections. We shall mostly follow notations in [18]. Throughout the paper, g and ∇ will denote the Riemannian metric and Chern connection of (M, ω), respectively. The torsion and curvature of ∇ are defined respectively by

$$\begin{cases} T(X,Y) = \nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X - [X,Y], \\ R(X,Y)Z = \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X,Y]} Z. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

In local coordinates $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$, $z_j = x_j + \sqrt{-1} y_j$ we denote $\partial_j = \partial/\partial z_j$, $\bar\partial_j = \partial/\partial \bar z_j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, and use the following notation

$$\begin{cases} g_{i\bar j} &= g(\partial_i, \bar\partial_j), \;\; \{g^{i\bar j}\} = \{g_{i\bar j}\}^{-1}, \\ T_{ij\bar k} &= g(T(\partial_i, \partial_j), \bar\partial_k), \;\; T^k_{ij} = g^{k\bar l} T_{ij\bar l}, \\ R_{i\bar j k\bar l} &= g(R(\partial_i, \bar\partial_j)\partial_k, \bar\partial_l) \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

and, for a function $v \in C^4(M)$, $v_{i\bar j} = v_{\bar j i} = \partial_i \bar\partial_j v$, $v_{i\bar j k} = \partial_k v_{i\bar j} - \Gamma^l_{ki} v_{l\bar j}$ and

$$v_{i\bar j k\bar l} = \bar\partial_l v_{i\bar j k} - \overline{\Gamma^q_{lj}} v_{i\bar q k}.$$

Recall that $v_{i\bar j} - v_{\bar j i} = 0$, $v_{ij} - v_{ji} = T^l_{ij} v_l$ and (see e.g, [18] and [19])

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} v_{i\bar j k} - v_{k\bar j i} &= T^l_{ik} v_{l\bar j}, \;\; v_{i\bar j k} - v_{ik\bar j} = -g^{l\bar m} R_{k\bar j i\bar m} v_l,\\ v_{i\bar j k\bar l} - v_{i\bar j \bar l k} &= g^{p\bar q} R_{k\bar l i\bar q} v_{p\bar j} - g^{p\bar q} R_{p\bar l k\bar j} v_{i\bar q},\\ v_{i\bar j k\bar l} - v_{k\bar l i\bar j} &= g^{p\bar q}(R_{k\bar l i\bar q} v_{p\bar j} - R_{i\bar j k\bar q} v_{p\bar l}) + T^p_{ik} v_{p\bar j\bar l} + \overline{T^q_{jl}} v_{i\bar q k} - T^p_{ik}\overline{T^q_{jl}} v_{p\bar q}. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $u \in C^2(\bar M)$ be a solution of equation (1.1). We denote

$$\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j} = \chi_{i\bar j} + u_{i\bar j},\ \{\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}\} = \{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j}\}^{-1},\ W = \mathrm{tr}\chi + \Delta u,\ F^{i\bar j} = \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{W}.$$

Locally equation (1.1) then takes the form

$$\det \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j} = \frac{\psi}{n} W \det g_{i\bar j}. \tag{2.4}$$

Finally, we note that since $\underline{u} \in C^2(\bar M)$ and $\chi_{\underline{u}} > 0$ on $\bar M$,

$$\epsilon\omega \le \chi_{\underline{u}} \le \epsilon^{-1}\omega \tag{2.5}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore,

$$F^{i\bar j}(\chi_{i\bar j} + \underline{u}_{i\bar j}) \ge \epsilon F^{i\bar j} g_{i\bar j}. \tag{2.6}$$

It is well known that $A \to (\det A/\mathrm{tr}A)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ is concave for positive definite Hermitian matrices A and hence so is $A \to \log\det A - \log\mathrm{tr}A$. Suppose $\underline{u}$ is a subsolution then

$$F^{i\bar j}(\underline{u}_{i\bar j} - u_{i\bar j}) \ge 0 \ \text{ in } M.$$

Consequently, $u - \underline{u}$ is constant if M is a closed manifold. The following *strict concavity* property plays crucial roles in our estimates.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\underline{u} \in C^2(M)$ be a subsolution of (2.7). There exist uniform constants $\theta, N > 0$ depending on ϵ and $\sup_M \psi$ such that when $W \ge N$,*

$$F^{i\bar j}(\underline{u}_{i\bar j} - u_{i\bar j}) \ge \theta(1 + F^{i\bar j} g_{i\bar j}). \tag{2.7}$$

This lemma actually holds under the weaker condition (1.7) and was proved in [14] for a class of equations including (1.1). For completeness we include a proof which seems simpler in our special case.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. At a fixed point assume that $g_{i\bar j} = \delta_{ij}$ and $\{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j}\}$ is diagonal. By (2.6) if some $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}$ is very small then (2.7) clearly holds. So we may assume $\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} \ge \cdots \ge$

$\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar{n}} \geq c_1$ (and therefore, $n\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}} \geq W$) where $c_1 > 0$ depends on ϵ. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\sum_{i\geq 2}\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}(\chi_{i\bar{i}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{i}})\Big)^{n-1} &\geq (n-1)^{n-1}\prod_{i\geq 2}\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}(\chi_{i\bar{i}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{i}})\\ &\geq (n-1)^{n-1}\frac{\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}}\det(\chi_{i\bar{j}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{j}})}{(\chi_{1\bar{1}}+\underline{u}_{1\bar{1}})\det(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}})}\\ &\geq (n-1)^{n-1}\frac{(\mathrm{tr}\chi+\Delta\underline{u})\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}}}{(\chi_{1\bar{1}}+\underline{u}_{1\bar{1}})W}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The second inequality in (2.8) follows from

$$\prod(\chi_{i\bar{i}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{i}}) \geq \det(\chi_{i\bar{j}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{j}})$$

while the third from the fact that $\underline{u}$ is a subsolution and u a solution of equation (2.4).

Assume now that $W \geq N$. It follows from equation (2.4) that for any $i = 2, \ldots n$,

$$W = \frac{n}{\psi}\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}}\cdots\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar{n}} \geq \frac{n}{\psi}\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}}c_1^{n-2} \geq \frac{Nc_1^{n-2}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}}}{\sup\psi} \equiv A\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar{1}}}{W} = 1 - \frac{1}{W}\sum_{i\geq 2}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}} \geq 1 - \frac{n-1}{A}. \tag{2.10}$$

On the other hand, by (2.5),

$$\frac{\mathrm{tr}\chi+\Delta\underline{u}}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}+\underline{u}_{1\bar{1}}} = 1 + \frac{1}{\chi_{1\bar{1}}+\underline{u}_{1\bar{1}}}\sum_{i\geq 2}(\chi_{i\bar{i}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{i}}) \geq 1+(n-1)\epsilon^2.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}(\chi_{i\bar{i}}+\underline{u}_{i\bar{i}}) \geq (n-1)(1+(n-1)\epsilon^2))^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(1-(n-1)A^{-1})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}.$$

Note that $F^{i\bar{i}} = \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{W}$, $F^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}} = n-1$. By (2.6), fixing N large we derive (2.7). $\square$

3. Gradient estimates

In this section we prove (1.4).

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $u \in C^3(M)\cap C^1(\bar{M})$ *be an admissible solution of equation* (1.1). *There exists a uniform constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\max_{\bar{M}}|\nabla u| \leq C\big(1+\max_{\partial M}|\nabla u|\big). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Let $\phi = Ae^{B\eta}$ where $\eta = \underline{u} - u - \inf_M(\underline{u} - u)$ and A, B are positive constants to be determined later. Suppose the function $e^{\phi}|\nabla u|^2$ attains its maximum at an interior point $p \in M$. We choose local coordinates around p such that $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}$ is diagonal at p where, unless otherwise indicated, the computations below are evaluated.

For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have

$$\frac{(|\nabla u|^2)_i}{|\nabla u|^2} + \phi_i = 0, \quad \frac{(|\nabla u|^2)_{\bar{i}}}{|\nabla u|^2} + \phi_{\bar{i}} = 0 \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\frac{(|\nabla u|^2)_{i\bar{i}}}{|\nabla u|^2} - \frac{|(|\nabla u|^2)_i|^2}{|\nabla u|^4} + \phi_{i\bar{i}} \leq 0. \tag{3.3}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$(|\nabla u|^2)_i = u_k u_{i\bar{k}} + u_{ki} u_{\bar{k}}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(|\nabla u|^2)_{i\bar{i}} &= u_{k\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{k}} + u_{ki} u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}} + u_{ki\bar{i}} u_{\bar{k}} + u_k u_{i\bar{k}\bar{i}} \\ &= u_{ki} u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}} + u_{i\bar{i}k} u_{\bar{k}} + u_{i\bar{i}\bar{k}} u_k + R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{l}} u_l u_{\bar{k}} \\ &\quad + \sum_k |u_{i\bar{k}} - T^k_{il} u_{\bar{l}}|^2 - \sum_k |T^k_{il} u_{\bar{l}}|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

On the other hand, differentiating equation (2.4) gives

$$F^{i\bar{i}} u_{i\bar{i}k} = f_k - F^{i\bar{i}} \chi_{i\bar{i}k}$$

where $f = \log\psi$. It follows that

$$F^{i\bar{i}}(|\nabla u|^2)_{i\bar{i}} \geq F^{i\bar{i}} u_{ki} u_{\bar{k}\bar{i}} + \sum_k F^{i\bar{i}} |u_{i\bar{k}} - T^k_{il} u_{\bar{l}}|^2 - C|\nabla u|^2 \sum F^{i\bar{i}} - 2|\nabla u||\nabla f|. \tag{3.6}$$

By (3.2) and (3.4),

$$|(|\nabla u|^2)_i|^2 = |u_{\bar{k}} u_{ki}|^2 - 2|\nabla u|^2 \mathfrak{Re}\{u_k u_{i\bar{k}} \phi_{\bar{i}}\} - |u_k u_{i\bar{k}}|^2 \tag{3.7}$$

Combining (3.3), (3.7) and (3.6), we obtain

$$|\nabla u|^2 F^{i\bar{i}} \phi_{i\bar{i}} + 2F^{i\bar{i}} \mathfrak{Re}\{u_k u_{i\bar{k}} \phi_{\bar{i}}\} \leq 2|\nabla u||\nabla f| + C|\nabla u|^2 \sum F^{i\bar{i}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Next,

$$\phi_i = B\phi\eta_i, \quad \phi_{i\bar{i}} = B\phi(B\eta_i\eta_{\bar{i}} + \eta_{i\bar{i}}).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\phi^{-1}F^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{u_k u_{i\bar k}\phi_{\bar i}\} &= 2BF^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{u_k u_{i\bar k}\eta_{\bar i}\} \\ &= 2BF^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}u_i\eta_{\bar i} - u_k\chi_{i\bar k}\eta_{\bar i}\} \\ &\geq 2BF^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{u_i\eta_{\bar i}\} - \frac{B^2}{2}|\nabla u|^2 F^{i\bar i}\eta_i\eta_{\bar i} - C\sum F^{i\bar i}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Therefore, by (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B}{2}F^{i\bar i}\eta_i\eta_{\bar i} + F^{i\bar i}\eta_{i\bar i} + 2F^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}\frac{\mathfrak{Re}\{u_i\eta_{\bar i}\}}{|\nabla u|^2} \\ \leq \frac{2|\nabla f|}{B\phi|\nabla u|} + C\Big(\frac{1}{|\nabla u|^2} + \frac{1}{B\phi}\Big)\sum F^{i\bar i}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Suppose now that $W \geq N$ where N is sufficiently large so that (2.7) holds. We consider two cases: (a) $\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar j} < c_1$ for some j and (b) $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i} \geq c_1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ where $c_1 > 0$ is a (sufficiently small) constant to be determined.

In case (a) we have by Lemma 2.1

$$F^{i\bar i}\eta_{i\bar i} \geq \frac{\theta}{2}F^{j\bar j} + \frac{\theta}{2}\Big(1 + \sum F^{i\bar i}\Big) \geq \frac{\theta}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{c_1} - \frac{1}{N}\Big) + \frac{\theta}{2}\Big(1 + \sum F^{i\bar i}\Big).$$

Note that

$$F^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}\frac{|\mathfrak{Re}\{u_i\eta_{\bar i}\}|}{|\nabla u|^2} \leq \frac{|\nabla \eta|}{|\nabla u|} \leq 2$$

provided that $|\nabla u| \geq |\nabla \underline{u}|$. So if c_1 is chosen sufficiently small, we derive a bound $|\nabla u| \leq C$ by (3.10) when B is sufficiently large.

In case (b) assume that $\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} \geq \cdots \geq \mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n}$. Then as in (2.9) we have for all $i \geq 2$

$$W = \frac{n}{\psi}\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1}\cdots\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n} \geq \frac{n}{\psi}\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}c_1^{n-2} \geq \frac{Wc_1^{n-2}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}}{\psi}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i} \leq c_1^{2-n}\sup_M \psi \equiv C_1, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n, \tag{3.11}$$

and

$$2\sum_{i\geq 2}F^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}\frac{\mathfrak{Re}\{u_i\eta_{\bar i}\}}{|\nabla u|^2} \geq -\frac{B}{4}\sum_{i\geq 2}F^{i\bar i}\eta_i\eta_{\bar i} - \frac{4C_1^2}{B}\sum_{i\geq 2}F^{i\bar i}. \tag{3.12}$$

On the other hand, by (3.11) we have $W \leq \mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} + (n-1)C_1$ and therefore,

$$F^{1\bar 1}\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} = 1 - \frac{\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1}}{W} \leq \frac{(n-1)C_1}{N}. \tag{3.13}$$

Plug (3.12) and (3.13) into (3.10) and assume $|\nabla u| \geq |\nabla \underline{u}|$. we obtain

$$F^{i\bar{i}}\eta_{i\bar{i}} \leq \frac{4(n-1)C_1}{N} + \frac{2|\nabla f|}{B\phi|\nabla u|} + \Big(\frac{4C_1^2}{B} + \frac{C}{|\nabla u|^2} + \frac{C}{B\phi}\Big)\sum F^{i\bar{i}}. \tag{3.14}$$

By Lemma 2.1, this gives a bound $|\nabla u| \leq C$ if we fix N and B sufficiently large.

Suppose now that $W \leq N$. By equation (2.4) we see that $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}} \geq c_1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ for some $c_1 > 0$ depending on $\inf_M \psi$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{c_1} \geq F^{i\bar{i}} = \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{1}{W} = \frac{\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}}{W}\sum_{j\neq i}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}} \geq \frac{(n-1)c_1}{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}}N} \geq \frac{(n-1)c_1}{N^2} \equiv c_0. \tag{3.15}$$

Thus $F^{i\bar{i}}\eta_i\eta_{\bar{i}} \geq c_0|\nabla\eta|^2$. Plugging these back in (3.10) we derive $|\nabla\eta| \leq C$ which in turn implies a bound $|\nabla u| \leq C$. □

4. THE SECOND ORDER ESTIMATES

Proposition 4.1. *Let $u \in C^4(M)\cap C^2(\bar{M})$ be an admissible solution of equation* (1.1)*. Suppose $\psi \geq 0$ and $\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \in C^{1,1}(\bar{M})$. Then there exists $C > 0$ depending on $\max_{\bar{M}}$, ϵ in* (2.5) *and the $C^{1,1}$ norms of χ, $\underline{u}$ and $\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ as well as the geometric quantities of M such that*

$$W \leq C\big(1 + \max_{\partial M} W\big) \quad \text{on } M. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Recall that $W = \Delta u + \mathrm{tr}\chi \geq 0$. We assume $\psi > 0$; the general case $\psi \geq 0$ follows from approximation. Suppose that $e^{\phi}W$ achieves its maximum at an interior point $p \in M$ where ϕ is a function to be determined. Choose local coordinates around p such that $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}$ is diagonal at p. We have (all calculations below are done at p),

$$\frac{W_i}{W} + \phi_i = 0, \quad \frac{W_{\bar{i}}}{W} + \phi_{\bar{i}} = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\frac{W_{i\bar{i}}}{W} - \frac{|W_i|^2}{W^2} + \phi_{i\bar{i}} \leq 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |W_i|^2 &= \Big|\sum_j \mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}i}\Big|^2 = \Big|\sum_j(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}}) + \lambda_i\Big|^2 \\ &= \Big|\sum_j(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}})\Big|^2 + 2\sum_j \mathfrak{Re}\{(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}})\overline{\lambda_i}\} + |\lambda_i|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\lambda_i = \sum_j (\chi_{j\bar{j}i} - \chi_{i\bar{j}j} + T^l_{ij}\chi_{l\bar{j}}).$$

By Schwarz inequality,

$$\Big|\sum_j (\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}})\Big|^2 \leq W \sum_j \mathfrak{g}^{j\bar{j}} |\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}}|^2. \tag{4.5}$$

By (4.2) we write

$$2\sum_j \mathfrak{Re}\{(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}})\overline{\lambda_i}\} = 2\mathfrak{Re}\{(W_i - \lambda_i)\overline{\lambda_i}\} = -2W\mathfrak{Re}\{\phi_i\overline{\lambda_i}\} - 2|\lambda_i|^2.$$

From (4.4) and (4.5) we see that

$$\frac{|W_i|^2}{W} \leq \mathfrak{g}^{j\bar{j}}|\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}}|^2 - 2\mathfrak{Re}\{\phi_i\overline{\lambda_i}\}. \tag{4.6}$$

Differentiating equation (2.4) twice we obtain (at p)

$$\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} - \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar{j}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}k}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{i}\bar{k}} - \frac{W_{k\bar{k}}}{W} + \frac{|W_k|^2}{W^2} = f_{k\bar{k}}. \tag{4.7}$$

From (2.3),

$$\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} - \mathfrak{g}_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}} = R_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}} - R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}\mathfrak{g}_{k\bar{k}} + 2\mathfrak{Re}\{\overline{T^j_{ik}}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}k}\} - |T^j_{ik}|^2\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}} - G_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} \tag{4.8}$$

where $G_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} = \chi_{k\bar{k}i\bar{i}} - \chi_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} + R_{k\bar{k}i\bar{p}}\chi_{p\bar{i}} - R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{p}}\chi_{p\bar{k}} + 2\mathfrak{Re}\{\overline{T^j_{ik}}\chi_{i\bar{j}k}\} - T^p_{ik}\overline{T^q_{ik}}\chi_{p\bar{q}}$. Combining (4.7) and (4.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} F^{i\bar{i}}W_{i\bar{i}} = & \sum_{i,j,k} \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar{j}}|\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}k} - T^j_{ik}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}}|^2 - \frac{|\nabla W|^2}{W^2} \\ & + \Delta f + (\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}_{k\bar{k}} - 1)R_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} + \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}G_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}} \\ \geq & \, \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar{j}}|\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}j} - T^j_{ij}\mathfrak{g}_{j\bar{j}}|^2 - \frac{|\nabla W|^2}{W^2} + \Delta f - (C_1W + C_2)\sum \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}} - C_3 \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where

$$C_1 = -\inf_M \inf_{i,j} R_{i\bar{i}j\bar{j}}, \quad C_2 = \inf_M \inf_i \sum_k G_{i\bar{i}k\bar{k}}, \quad C_3 = \sup_M \sum_{i,j} R_{i\bar{i}j\bar{j}}.$$

By (4.3), (4.6) and (4.9),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & \, F^{i\bar{i}}W_{i\bar{i}} - \frac{\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}|W_i|^2}{W} + \frac{|\nabla W|^2}{W^2} + WF^{i\bar{i}}\phi_{i\bar{i}} \\ \geq & \, WF^{i\bar{i}}\phi_{i\bar{i}} + 2\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}}\mathfrak{Re}\{\phi_i\overline{\lambda_i}\} - CW\sum \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar{i}} + \Delta f. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Let $\phi = e^{A\eta}$ where $\eta = \underline{u} - u + \sup_M (u - \underline{u})$ and A is a positive constant. We see that $\phi_i = A\phi\eta_i$ and $\phi_{i\bar i} = A\phi\eta_{i\bar i} + A^2\phi\eta_i\eta_{\bar i}$. Therefore, applying Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{\phi_i\overline{\lambda_i}\} &= 2A\phi F^{i\bar i}\mathfrak{Re}\{\eta_i\overline{\lambda_i}\} + 2A\phi W^{-1}\mathfrak{Re}\{\eta_i\overline{\lambda_i}\} \\
&\geq -A^2\phi F^{i\bar i}|\eta_i|^2 - C\phi\sum F^{i\bar i} - \frac{C\phi}{W^2}\sum\frac{1}{F^{i\bar i}} \\
&\geq -WA^2\phi F^{i\bar i}|\eta_i|^2 - C\phi\Big(\psi^{\frac{1}{1-n}} + \sum F^{i\bar i}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

The last inequality in (4.11) follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{j\bar j} &= \mathfrak{g}^{j\bar j} - \frac{1}{W} = \frac{\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar j}}{W}\sum_{k\neq j}\mathfrak{g}_{k\bar k} \geq \frac{\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar j}}{W}\Big(\prod_{k\neq j}\mathfrak{g}_{k\bar k}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \\
&= \frac{1}{W}(\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar j})^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(\det\mathfrak{g}_{k\bar l})^{\frac{1}{n-1}} = \frac{1}{W^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}}(\mathfrak{g}^{j\bar j})^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\Big(\frac{\psi}{n}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq \frac{\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{nW^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose W is sufficiently large. Then by Lemma 2.1

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{A\phi}F^{i\bar i}\phi_{i\bar i} &= F^{i\bar i}\eta_{i\bar i} + AF^{i\bar i}\eta_i\eta_{\bar i} \\
&\geq AF^{i\bar i}\eta_i\eta_{\bar i} + \theta\Big(1 + \sum F^{i\bar i}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

It follows from (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) that

$$\theta A(W - C) - C\psi^{\frac{1}{1-n}}W + \phi^{-1}\Delta f + W(\theta A - C - C\phi^{-1})\sum\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar i} \leq 0 \tag{4.13}$$

provided that W is large enough. We obtain when A is sufficiently large,

$$\frac{\theta}{2}AW\sum\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar i} \leq C\psi^{\frac{1}{1-n}}W - \Delta f. \tag{4.14}$$

Note that $|\Delta f| \leq C\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ where C depends on $|\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}|_{C^{1,1}(\bar M)}$; see e.g. [24]. We assume $\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} \geq \cdots \geq \mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n}$ (and therefore, $n\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1} \geq W$). As in (2.8) we have

$$\sum\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar i} \geq (n-1)\prod_{i\geq 2}(\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar i})^{\frac{1}{n-1}} = \frac{(n-1)\mathfrak{g}_{1\bar 1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{\det(\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \geq \frac{n-1}{n\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}. \tag{4.15}$$

Fixing A sufficiently large we obtain a bound for W at p from (4.14). □

5. Boundary estimates for second derivatives

In this section we derive *a priori* estimates for second derivatives on the boundary

$$\max_{\partial M} |\nabla^2 u| \leq C. \tag{5.1}$$

As in [18] we follow the methods of [20], [16], [17] using subsolutions in construction of barrier functions. The new technical tool needed in this approach is Lemma 2.1.

To derive (5.1) let us consider a boundary point $0 \in \partial M$. We shall use normal coordinates around 0 such that $\partial/\partial x_n$ is the interior normal direction to ∂M at 0. For convenience we set

$$t_{2k-1} = x_k,\ t_{2k} = y_k,\ 1 \leq k \leq n-1;\ t_{2n-1} = y_n,\ t_{2n} = x_n$$

and write for a function $v \in C^3(\bar M)$

$$v_{t_\alpha} = \partial_{t_\alpha} v,\ v_{it_\alpha} = \nabla_{t_\alpha i} v := \partial_{t_\alpha}\partial_i v - \partial_{\nabla_{t_\alpha}\partial_i} v,\ v_{\bar i t_\alpha} = \nabla_{t_\alpha \bar i} v, \text{ etc.}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{ix_j} - v_{x_j i} &= v_{ij} - v_{ji} = T^l_{ij} v_l, \\ v_{iy_j} - v_{y_j i} &= \sqrt{-1}(v_{ij} - v_{ji}) = \sqrt{-1} T^l_{ij} v_l. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Similarly, $v_{\bar i x_j} - v_{x_j \bar i} = \overline{T^l_{ij}} v_{\bar l}$ and $v_{\bar i y_j} - v_{y_j \bar i} = -\sqrt{-1}\,\overline{T^l_{ij}} v_{\bar l}$. Moreover, by (2.3) one derives

$$\begin{aligned} v_{i\bar j x_k} - v_{x_k i\bar j} &= - g^{l\bar m} R_{i\bar j k\bar m} v_l + T^l_{ik} v_{l\bar j} + \overline{T^l_{jk}} v_{i\bar l}, \\ v_{i\bar j y_k} - v_{y_k i\bar j} &= \sqrt{-1}(-g^{l\bar m} R_{i\bar j k\bar m} v_l + T^l_{ik} v_{l\bar j} - \overline{T^l_{jk}} v_{i\bar l}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Since $u - \varphi = 0$ on ∂M, one derives

$$|u_{t_\alpha t_\beta}(0)| \leq C, \quad \alpha, \beta < 2n \tag{5.4}$$

where C depends on $|u|_{C^1(\bar M)}$, $|\underline{u}|_{C^1(\bar M)}$, and the principal curvatures of ∂M.

To estimate $u_{t_\alpha x_n}(0)$ for $\alpha \leq 2n$, we shall employ a barrier function of the form

$$v = (u - \underline{u}) + t\sigma - T\sigma^2 \ \text{ in } \Omega_\delta = M \cap B_\delta \tag{5.5}$$

where t, T are positive constants to be determined, B_δ is the (geodesic) ball of radius δ centered at p, and σ is the distance function to ∂M. Note that σ is smooth in $M_{\delta_0} := \{z \in M : \sigma(z) < \delta_0\}$ for some $\delta_0 > 0$.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists* $c_0 > 0$ *such that for* T *sufficiently large and* t, δ *sufficiently small,* $v \geq 0$ *and*

$$F^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}} \leq -c_0(1 + F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}}) \quad in \;\; \Omega_\delta. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Note that, since σ is smooth and $\sigma = 0$ on ∂M, for fixed t and T we may require δ to be so small that $v \geq 0$ in Ω_δ. Note also that

$$F^{i\bar{j}} \sigma_{i\bar{j}} \leq C_1 F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$ under control. Therefore,

$$F^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}} \leq F^{i\bar{j}} (u_{i\bar{j}} - \underline{u}_{i\bar{j}}) + C_1(t + T\sigma) F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}} - 2T F^{i\bar{j}} \sigma_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} \;\; \text{in} \;\; \Omega_\delta. \tag{5.7}$$

Fix $N > 0$ sufficiently large so that Lemma 2.1 holds. At a fixed point in Ω_δ, we consider two cases: (a) $W \leq N$ and (b) $W > N$.

In case (a) let $\lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $\{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}\}$. We see from equation (2.4) that there is a uniform lower bound $\lambda_1 \geq c_1 > 0$. Consequently,

$$F^{i\bar{j}} \sigma_i \sigma_{\bar{j}} \geq \Big(\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{W}\Big) |\nabla \sigma|^2 \geq \frac{c_1(n-1)}{\lambda_n W} |\nabla \sigma|^2 \geq \frac{c_1(n-1)}{N^2} |\nabla \sigma|^2 = \frac{c_1(n-1)}{4N^2}. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $T = \frac{2nN^2}{c_1(n-1)}$. By (5.7) and (2.7),

$$F^{i\bar{j}} v_{i\bar{j}} \leq n - 1 + (C_1(t + T\sigma) - \epsilon) F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}} - \frac{c_1(n-1)T}{2N^2} \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{2}(1 + F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}}) \tag{5.9}$$

if we require t and δ small enough to satisfy $C_1(t + T\delta) \leq \epsilon/2$.

Suppose now that $W > N$. By Lemma 2.1 and (5.7), we may further require t and δ to satisfy $C_1(t + T\delta) \leq \theta/2$ so that (5.6) holds. ☐

Using Lemma 5.1 we may derive the estimates $|u_{t_\alpha x_n}(0)| \leq C$ (and therefore $|u_{x_n t_\alpha}(0)| \leq C$) for $\alpha < 2n$ as in [18]; we shall only give an outline of the proof here to correct some minor errors in [18].

For fixed $\alpha < 2n$, we write $\eta = \sigma_{t_\alpha}/\sigma_{x_n}$ and define

$$\mathcal{T} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t_\alpha}} - \eta \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}}.$$

We have

$$|\mathcal{T}(u - \varphi)| + (u_{y_n} - \varphi_{y_n})^2 \leq C \;\; \text{in} \; \Omega_\delta.$$

On ∂M since $u - \varphi = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is a tangential differential operator, we have

$$\mathcal{T}(u - \varphi) = 0 \;\; \text{on} \; \partial M \cap B_\delta$$

and, similarly,

$$(u_{y_n} - \varphi_{y_n})^2 \leq C\rho^2 \text{ on } \partial M \cap B_\delta. \tag{5.10}$$

In [18] we used the formula

$$\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}(\mathcal{T}u)_{i\bar j} = \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}(u_{t_\alpha i\bar j} + \eta u_{x_n i\bar j}) + \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}\eta_{i\bar j}u_{x_n} + 2\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}\mathfrak{Re}\{\eta_i u_{x_n\bar j}\}. \tag{5.11}$$

The correct one should be

$$\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}(\mathcal{T}u)_{i\bar j} = \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}((u_{t_\alpha})_{i\bar j} - \eta(u_{x_n})_{i\bar j}) - \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}\eta_{i\bar j}u_{x_n} - 2\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}\mathfrak{Re}\{\eta_i (u_{x_n})_{\bar j}\}. \tag{5.12}$$

We have $(u_{t_\alpha})_{\bar j} = u_{t_\alpha \bar j} + u_{\nabla_j t_\alpha}$ and

$$(u_{t_\alpha})_{i\bar j} = u_{t_\alpha i\bar j} + u_{i(\nabla_{\bar j} t_\alpha)} + u_{(\nabla_i t_\alpha)\bar j} - u_{\nabla_i \nabla_j t_\alpha}. \tag{5.13}$$

Note that $u_{i(\nabla_{\bar j} t_\alpha)} + u_{(\nabla_i t_\alpha)\bar j}$ is equal to a linear combination of terms in the form $u_{i\bar l}$ and $u_{k\bar j}$ since $\nabla_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar z_k} = 0$, and that $|F^{i\bar j}\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar k}| \leq C$.

Differentiating equation (2.4) with respect to t_α, $\alpha \leq 2n$, by (5.3) we obtain

$$|F^{i\bar j}u_{t_\alpha i\bar j}| \leq |(\log\psi)_{t_\alpha}| + |F^{i\bar j}\chi_{i\bar j t_\alpha}| + |F^{i\bar j}(u_{t_\alpha i\bar j} - u_{i\bar j t_\alpha})| \leq C(1 + F^{i\bar j}g_{i\bar j}). \tag{5.14}$$

Here we also used the identity

$$F^{i\bar j}T^l_{ki}u_{l\bar j} = T^i_{ki} - \frac{1}{W}T^l_{ki}\mathfrak{g}_{l\bar j} - F^{i\bar j}T^l_{ki}\chi_{l\bar j}. \tag{5.15}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} F^{i\bar j}\eta_i(u-\varphi)_{x_n\bar j} &= F^{i\bar j}\eta_i(2(u-\varphi)_{n\bar j} + \sqrt{-1}(u-\varphi)_{y_n\bar j}) \\ &= 2\eta_n - 2\frac{\eta_i\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar i}}{W} - 2F^{i\bar j}\eta_i(\chi_{n\bar j} + \varphi_{n\bar j}) + \sqrt{-1}F^{i\bar j}\eta_i(u-\varphi)_{y_n\bar j}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

By (5.14) and (5.16) we obtain

$$|\mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}((u_{t_\alpha})_{i\bar j} - \eta(u_{x_n})_{i\bar j})| \leq |\mathcal{T}(f)| + C_1(1 + \mathfrak{g}^{i\bar j}g_{i\bar j}). \tag{5.17}$$

Now the rest of the proof is similar to [18]. In summary we have

$$|u_{t_\alpha x_n}(0)| \leq C \text{ and } |u_{x_n t_\alpha}(0)| \leq C, \quad \alpha < 2n. \tag{5.18}$$

To finish the proof of (5.1) it suffices to prove

$$\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n}(0) \leq C. \tag{5.19}$$

Expanding $\det \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j}(0)$, by equation (2.4) we see that

$$\det \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar j}(0) = a\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n}(0) - b = \psi \sum \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar i}(0) \tag{5.20}$$

where $a = \det(\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)|_{\{1\leq\alpha,\beta\leq n-1\}})$ and $b \geq 0$ is bounded. To show $\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar n}(0) \leq C$ we only have to derive a uniform positive lower bound for $a - \psi(0)$. For this we shall use an idea of Trudinger [40] combined with Lemma 2.1.

Let $T_C\partial M$ be the complex tangent bundle of ∂M and

$$T_C^{1,0}\partial M = T^{1,0}M \cap T_C\partial M = \Big\{\xi \in T^{1,0}M : d\sigma(\xi) = 0\Big\}.$$

Let $\hat{\chi_u}$ and $\hat\omega$ denote the restrictions to $T_C\partial M$ of χ_u and ω respectively. We wish to show

$$m_0 = \min_{\partial M} \frac{\hat{\chi_u}^{n-1}}{\psi\hat\omega^{n-1}} > 1.$$

Suppose m_0 is attained at a point $0 \in \partial M$. Choose local coordinates around 0 as before so $\partial/\partial x_n$ is the interior normal direction to ∂M at 0.

Let $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_{n-1}$ be a local frame of vector fields in $T_C^{(1,0)}\partial M$ with $g(\zeta_\alpha, \bar{\zeta_\beta}) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\zeta_\alpha(0) = \tau_\alpha(0)$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\beta} = \chi_u(\zeta_\alpha, \bar{\zeta_\beta})$. Then

$$\hat{\chi_u}^{n-1} = \det(\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta})\hat\omega^{n-1}.$$

We extend $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_{n-1}$ by their parallel transports along geodesics normal to ∂M so that they are smoothly defined in a neighborhood of 0. Similarly we assume φ is extended smoothly to $\bar M$. We denote $\tilde u_{\alpha\beta} = u_{\zeta_\alpha\bar\zeta_\beta}$, etc.

Define, for a positive definite $n-1$ by $n-1$ Hermitian matrix $\{r_{\alpha\bar\beta}\}$,

$$G[r_{\alpha\bar\beta}] \equiv \det(r_{\alpha\bar\beta})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$$

and let

$$G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta} = \frac{\partial G}{\partial r_{\alpha\bar\beta}}[\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)].$$

Note that G is concave and homogeneous of degree one. Therefore, for any $\{r_{\alpha\bar\beta}\} > 0$,

$$G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta} r_{\alpha\bar\beta} \geq G[r_{\alpha\bar\beta}].$$

Since $\tilde u_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) = u_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) = \underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) - (u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0)\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}$,

$$G[\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)] = G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) = G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}(\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) + \chi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)) - (u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0)G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0).$$

Suppose that for some small $\theta_0 > 0$ to be determined,

$$(u - \underline{u})_{x_n}(0)G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) \leq \theta_0 G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}(\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0) + \chi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}G[\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)] \geq\,& (1-\theta_0)G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}(\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)+\chi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0))\\ \geq\,& (1-\theta_0)G[\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)+\chi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)]\\ \geq\,& (1-\theta_0)\Big(\frac{\det(\underline{u}_{i\bar j}+\chi_{i\bar j})}{\underline{u}_{n\bar n}+\chi_{n\bar n}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\\ =\,& (1-\theta_0)\Big(\frac{(\Delta\underline{u}+\mathrm{tr}\chi)\psi}{\underline{u}_{n\bar n}+\chi_{n\bar n}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\\ \geq\,& (1-\theta_0)(1+(n-1)\epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(0).\end{aligned}$$

Choosing θ_0 small enough we obtain

$$m_0=\frac{\det\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)}{\psi(0)}\geq 1+\frac{\theta_0}{2}.$$

Suppose now that

$$(u-\underline{u})_{x_n}(0)G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)>\theta_0G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}(\underline{u}_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)+\chi_{\alpha\bar\beta}(0)).$$

On ∂M near 0,

$$\tilde u_{\alpha\bar\beta}=\tilde\varphi_{\alpha\bar\beta}-(u-\varphi)_\nu\tilde\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$$

where ν is the interior unit normal to ∂M. Write

$$\nu=\sum_{\alpha\leq 2n}\nu^\alpha\frac{\partial}{\partial t_\alpha}.$$

We have $|(u-\varphi)_{t_\alpha}|\leq C\rho$ and $|\nu^\alpha|\leq C\rho$ since $\nu^\alpha(0)=0$ for $\alpha<2n$ and $u=\varphi$ on ∂M. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi =\,& G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}(\tilde\varphi_{\alpha\bar\beta}+\tilde\chi_{\alpha\bar\beta})-(u-\varphi)_{x_n}\nu^{2n}G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\tilde\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}-(m_0\psi)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\\ \equiv\,& -(u-\varphi)_{x_n}\eta+Q\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta\equiv\nu^{2n}G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\tilde\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ and Q are smooth. On ∂M,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi =\,& G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\mathfrak{a}_{\alpha\bar\beta}+[(u-\varphi)_\nu-\nu^{2n}(u-\varphi)_{x_n}]G_0^{\alpha\bar\beta}\tilde\sigma_{\alpha\bar\beta}-(m_0\psi)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\\ \geq\,& [(u-\varphi)_\nu-\nu^{2n}(u-\varphi)_{x_n}]\geq -C\rho^2\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi(0)=0$ and

$$\eta(0)\geq\theta_0(1+(n-1)\epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\psi^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(0)/(u-\underline{u})_{x_n}(0)\geq c_2>0.$$

We calculate as before using (5.13)

$$F^{i\bar j}\Phi_{i\bar j}\leq -\eta F^{i\bar j}u_{x_ni\bar j}-2F^{i\bar j}\mathfrak{Re}\{\eta_i(u-\varphi)_{x_n\bar j}\}+CF^{i\bar j}g_{i\bar j}. \tag{5.21}$$

Therefore, by (5.14) and (5.16)

$$F^{i\bar{j}}(\Phi - |(u-\varphi)_{y_n}|^2)_{i\bar{j}} \leq C(1 + F^{i\bar{j}} g_{i\bar{j}}). \tag{5.22}$$

Consequently, by Lemma 5.1 we see that $Av + B\rho^2 + \Phi - |(u-\varphi)_{y_n}|^2 \geq 0$ on $\partial(M \cap B_\delta(0))$ and

$$F^{i\bar{j}}[Av + B\rho^2 + \Phi - |(u-\varphi)_{y_n}|^2]_{i\bar{j}} \leq 0 \text{ in } M \cap B_\delta(0) \tag{5.23}$$

when $A \gg B \gg 1$. By the maximum principle, $Av + B\rho + \Phi - |(u-\varphi)_{y_n}|^2 \geq 0$ in $M \cap B_\delta(0)$. Note that $\Phi(0) = G[\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}(0)] - (m_0\psi(0))^{\frac{1}{n-1}} = 0$. We see that $\Phi_{x_n}(0) \geq -C$. This proves

$$u_{x_n x_n}(0) \leq \frac{C}{\eta(0)} \leq \frac{C}{c_2}. \tag{5.24}$$

So we have an *a priori* upper bound for all eigenvalues of $\{\mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{j}}(0)\}$. Therefore they must admit a positive lower bound. Consequently, by equation (2.4),

$$m_0 \geq \frac{\sum \mathfrak{g}_{i\bar{i}}(0)}{\mathfrak{g}_{n\bar{n}}(0)} \geq 1 + c_0.$$

This completes the proof of (5.1).

References

[1] T. Aubin, *Équations du type Monge-Ampère sur les variétés kählériennes compactes*, (French) Bull. Sci. Math. (2) **102** (1978), 63–95.

[2] Z. Blocki, *A gradient estimate in the Calabi-Yau theorem*, Math. Ann. **344** (2009), 317–327.

[3] Z. Blocki, *On geodesics in the space of Kähler metrics*, preprint.

[4] L. A. Caffarelli, J. J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations II. Complex Monge-Ampère and uniformly elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Applied Math. **38** (1985), 209–252.

[5] E. Calabi, *The space of Kähler metrics*, Proc. ICM, Amsterdam 1954, Vol. 2, 206–207, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1956.

[6] X.-X. Chen, *The space of Kähler metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **56** (2000), 189–234.

[7] X.-X. Chen, *A new parabolic flow in Kähler manifolds*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **12** (2004), 837–852.

[8] P. Cherrier, *Equations de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes*, Bull. Sci. Math. **111** (1987), 343–385.

[9] P. Cherrier and A. Hanani, *Le problème de Dirichlet pour des équations de Monge-Ampère en métrique hermitienne*, Bull. Sci. Math. **123** (1999), 577–597.

[10] S. Dinew and S. Kolodziej, *Liouville and Calabi-Yau type theorems for complex Hessian equations*, arXiv: 1203.3995.

[11] S. K. Donaldson, *Symmetric spaces, Kähler geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics*, Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar, 13–33, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, **196**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[12] S. K. Donaldson, *Moment maps and diffeomorphisms*, Asian J. Math. **3** (1999), 1–16.

[13] S. K. Donaldson, *Two-forms on four-manifolds and elliptic equations*, in Inspired by Chern, World Scientific, 2006.

[14] H. Fang, M.-J. Lai and X.-N. Ma, *On a class of fully nonlinear flows in Kähler geometry* J. Reine Angew. Math. **653** (2011), 189–220.

[15] M. Gill, *Convergence of the parabolic complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **19** (2011), 277–304.

[16] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for Monge-Ampère equations in non-convex domains and space-like hypersurfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), 4955–4971.

[17] B. Guan, *The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and regularity of the pluri-complex Green function*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **6** (1998), 687–703. *A correction*, **8** (2000), 213–218.

[18] B. Guan and Q. Li, *Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds*, Adv. Math. **225** (2010) 1185–1223.

[19] B. Guan and Q. Li, *A Monge-Ampère type fully nonlinear equation on Hermitian manifolds*, Disc. Cont. Dynam. Syst. B **17** (2012) 1991–1999.

[20] B. Guan and J. Spruck, *Boundary value problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$ for surfaces of constant Gauss curvature*, Annals of Math. **138** (1993), 601–624.

[21] P.-F. Guan, *Extremal functions related to intrinsic norms*, Ann. of Math. **156** (2002), 197–211.

[22] P.-F. Guan, *Remarks on the homogeneous complex Monge-Ampère equation*, Complex Analysis, Trends in Math., Springer Basel AG. (2010), 175–185.

[23] P.-F. Guan, *A gradient estimate for complex Monge-Ampère equation*, unpublished.

[24] P.-F. Guan, N. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang, *On the Dirichlet problem for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations*, Acta Math. **182** (1999), 87–104.

[25] A. Hanani, *Équations du type de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes*, J. Funct. Anal. **137** (1996), 49–75.

[26] G. La Nave and G. Tian, *Soliton-type metrics and Kähler–Ricci flow on symplectic quotients*, preprint, arXiv: 0903.2413v1.

[27] S.-Y. Li, *On the Dirichlet problems for symmetric function equations of the eigenvalues of the complex Hessian*, Asian J. Math. **8** (2004), 87–106.

[28] D.H. Phong and J. Sturm, *The Dirichlet problem for degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equations*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **18** (2010), 145–170.

[29] J. Song and B. Weinkove, *On the convergence and singularities of the J-flow with applications to the Mabuchi energy*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **61** (2008), 210–229.

[30] J. Streets and G. Tian, *A parabolic flow of pluriclosed metrics*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2010** (2010), 3101–3133.

[31] J. Streets and G. Tian, *Hermitian curvature flow*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **13** (2011), 601–634.

[32] J. Streets and G. Tian, *Regularity theory for pluriclosed flow*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), 1–4.

[33] J. Streets and G. Tian, *Generalized Kähler geometry and the pluriclosed flow*, Nuclear Phys. B **858** (2012), 366–376.

[34] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *Estimates for the complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian and balanced manifolds*, Asian J. Math. **14** (2010), 19–40.

[35] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 1187–1195.

[36] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, *The Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **10** (2011), 437–447.

[37] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, *The Calabi-Yau equation, symplectic forms and almost complex structures*, Geometry and analysis. No. 1, 475–493, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM) 17, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2011.

[38] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, *On the evolution of a Hermitian metric by its Chern-Ricci form*, arXiv:1201.0312

[39] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove, and S.-T. Yau, *Taming symplectic forms and the Calabi-Yau equation*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **97** (2008), 401–424.

[40] N. S. Trudinger, *On the Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations*, Acta Math. **175** (1995), 151–164.

[41] B. Weinkove, *Convergence of the J-flow on Kähler surfaces*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **12** (2004), 949–965.

[42] B. Weinkove, *On the J-flow in higher dimensions and the lower boundedness of the Mabuchi energy*, J. Differential Geom. **73** (2006), 351–358.

[43] B. Weinkove *The Calabi-Yau equation on almost-Kähler four-manifolds* J. Differential Geom. **76** (2007), 317–349.

[44] S.-T. Yau, *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. I.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), 339–411.

[45] X.-W. Zhang, *A priori estimate for complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **2010** (2010), 3814–3836.

Department of Mathematics, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210
E-mail address: `guan@math.osu.edu`

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435
E-mail address: `qun.li@wright.edu`